

In Defense of the Cuban Revolution

*An Answer to the State Department
and Theodore Draper*

By Joseph Hansen

25¢

CONTENTS

IN DEFENSE OF THE CUBAN REVOLUTION

An Answer to the State Department and Theodore Draper

By Joseph Hansen 3

STOP THE CRIME AGAINST CUBA!

Statement of the Political Committee,

Socialist Workers Party 23

EXCERPTS FROM DR. RAUL ROA'S SPEECH AT

THE UNITED NATIONS 27

The contents of this pamphlet originally appeared, April 10, 17 and 24, 1961, in the Militant, weekly socialist newspaper, published at 116 University Place, New York 3, N. Y.

PIONEER PUBLISHERS

116 University Place

New York 3, N. Y.

May, 1961

In Defense of the Cuban Revolution

By Joseph Hansen

"But," said Mr. Hennessey, "these open-shop min ye menshun say they are f'r unions if properly conducted."

"Shure," said Mr. Dooley, "if properly conducted. No strikes, no rules, no contracts, no scales, hardly iny wages and dam few members."

The effort to overthrow the Revolutionary Government of Cuba proceeds on various fronts.

The Cuban counterrevolutionaries have set up a "government in exile" dedicated to restoring the nationalized properties to their former owners. They have projected an early invasion of the island. By way of anticipation, terrorists have been planting bombs indiscriminately in crowded areas of Havana. Others have sought to form guerrilla nuclei of a counterrevolutionary army inside Cuba. In military camps in Florida and Guatemala still other contingents are in training for the landing.

Behind these Benedict Arnolds and mercenary killers stand well-

heeled henchmen of former dictator Batista, some giant U.S. corporations and the sinister Central Intelligence Agency that accounts to no one for the enormous funds it disburses. Behind them, too, stand the Democratic and Republican parties. By cutting off sugar imports and imposing a tight economic blockade on the small country, Eisenhower and Congress sought to starve the Cuban people into submission. Kennedy, since coming into office, has tried to tighten the screws still further.

On another front, the State Department broke off diplomatic relations and pressed all the Latin-American countries to follow suit in a holy anti-Communist crusade against a rebellious people that dared lay profane hands on Wall Street's holdings. American tourists whom the Castro government sought to attract to the tropical vacationland were scared away by the State Department in order to cut down Cuba's income from tourism, and when a few went anyway to see for themselves what the truth might be, the State De-

924148

partment slammed down its own Iron Curtain, putting Cuba off bounds in violation of the democratic right of American citizens to travel any place they please for pleasure or education.

To this, add the media of mass communication in the United States. The press, radio and TV payola boys and quiz geniuses are doing their utmost to prepare public opinion for the planned conversion of Cuba into another Guatemala or Korea, campaigning with ferocious intensity against the Castro government, picturing it as having gone "Communist," the more lurid ones talking darkly about Russian "spies" and Russian "rocket bases" a few miles off the coast of Florida.

Where Draper Comes In

In a key area, however, public opinion is far from that state of brain-washed stupor displayed at the opening of the Korean conflict. In fact, well-known figures, who have taken the trouble to make first-hand investigations, have spoken up forcefully in behalf of the beleaguered Cuban people and against Washington's reactionary designs. Their reports have had great impact, particularly among intellectuals. This has given the counterrevolutionary propagandists a problem somewhat beyond their customary skills. How do you win, or at least neutralize, thoughtful persons inclined to support the Cuban side because of facts they have read in *Listen, Yankee!* or similar sources? The matter is important because such people can articulate and lead public opposition to an armed adventure in the Caribbean.

This is where Theodore Draper comes in. As the author of *The Roots of American Communism*

and *American Communism and Soviet Russia*, the first two volumes of a three-volume history of the American Communist party, Draper has won a reputation for scrupulous concern for facts and for expert knowledge of the communist movement. His reputation for factual accuracy in the two published volumes is solidly based, whatever the final verdict may be on the correspondence between his general opinions and the truth. Draper has now entered the political struggle over Cuba, bringing to bear the reputation he earned as a historian. His contention is that Castro "betrayed" the Cuban revolution and is taking Cuba down the road to totalitarianism. This is a well-gnawed theme in the Cuban counterrevolutionary press; Eisenhower philosophized on it a bit between rounds of golf; and the State Department has adopted it as the official line for its propaganda machine. Draper offers it in a highly sophisticated version aimed at providing intellectuals with a perfect rationalization for abandoning any sympathy for the Castro regime.

The article, *Castro's Cuba — A Revolution Betrayed?*, appeared as the main feature in the March issue of *Encounter*, a British monthly, and has now been reprinted in New York by the social-democratic *New Leader* as a supplement in pamphlet form to its March 27 issue. The pamphlet is advertised at 25 cents a copy, \$20 for 100, or \$175 for 1,000 copies, an attractive offer, it must be admitted, in case you feel strongly about that man in Havana, have dough to back your feelings, and want to help spread the anti-Castro gospel.

As his immediate targets, Draper takes the "myth makers"; namely,

authors of favorable reports on the Cuban revolution, singling out for special attention Jean-Paul Sartre, Simone de Beauvoir, C. Wright Mills, Samuel Shapiro, Paul Johnson, Leo Huberman and Paul M. Sweezy. They get rough treatment.

Mills, a "Front Man"?

For example, Draper admits that C. Wright Mills of Columbia University, who wrote *Listen, Yankee!*, gives an authentic account of the way the Cuban leaders talk, which was what Mills set out to do. ("Sometimes the words in the book," says Draper, "were so close to those I had heard that I felt I knew the name of the source.") Yet Draper insists that a reader has "a right to expect" that a "sociologist would at least be able to give a reasonably accurate report of the social structure of the country" and he condemns Mills' effort: "The book as a whole is just as honest and dishonest as any unrelieved propaganda is likely to be, and if Mills merely sought to be a front man for the Castro propaganda machine, he has succeeded brilliantly. But is that all that should be expected of C. Wright Mills?"

To avoid having his own article appear as unrelieved propaganda, Draper also attacks *Red Star Over Cuba*, a book by Nathaniel Weyl that makes Castro out to have been "a trusted Soviet agent" since 1948. An audience that knows anything at all about Cuba will reject that out of hand as a product of the Batista propaganda machine. Draper, naturally, is severe with Weyl.

Draper combs the writings of his targets for inconsistencies; or seeming inconsistencies, inaccuracies and muddleheaded theory.

Not unexpectedly, he succeeds well in this enterprise, particularly in finding inconsistencies of interpretation and theoretical blunders among the various authors. The Cuban reality is complex; the reporters are variegated in background and outlook and ill-equipped in revolutionary theory. Draper finds Huberman and Sweezy, the editors of *Monthly Review*, especially vulnerable. He makes much, for instance, of such things as their conclusion from a "personal incident" — an interview with a few peasants through a translator — that the Cuban peasants are not "anxious to own their own plots of land" and "didn't understand the question at all until it had been repeatedly rephrased and explained." Draper acidly observes that "the Cuban peasants are truly unique, and no one apparently ever understood them before — certainly not Fidel Castro who put so much emphasis on giving them their own land in 1953 and after."

Yet this campaign in behalf of accuracy and consistency and theoretical clarity is not exactly free from tendentiousness. In the case of Cuba — *Anatomy of a Revolution*, for example, our historian, despite his reputation for objectivity, somehow manages to avoid challenging the main point made by Huberman and Sweezy — that the Cuban revolution is doing well economically and has already brought impressive benefits to the poorest layers of workers and peasants. Similarly he appears to have concluded that for a politically minded research expert, silence is the best policy to adopt toward the critical opinion expressed by Huberman and Sweezy of the Cuban Communist party. Discussion of that theme might conflict

with picturing the CP as a monolithic juggernaut rolling toward totalitarian power in Cuba.

Rigorous as he is in the standards he imposes on the theses of others, Draper is a bit more relaxed when it comes to his own. One of his central contentions is that Castro is a "Pied Piper" bent on leading Cuba into the camp of Stalinism. The conclusion really follows from preconceptions Draper brings to his analysis, but he also tries to find facts to support it. Here is one which he presents like a prosecuting attorney as a key piece of evidence in his case:

"Events have also dealt unkindly with Jean-Paul Sartre's clairvoyance. In the introduction (dated September 12, 1960) to the Brazilian edition of his series of articles on Cuba, he wrote: 'No, if Cuba desires to separate from the Western bloc, it is not through the crazy ambition of linking itself to the Eastern bloc.' He also communicated his certainty that 'its objective is not to strengthen one bloc to the detriment of the other.' On December 10, Major Guevara was 'crazy' enough to announce publicly in Moscow: 'We wholeheartedly support the statement adopted by this conference [of 81 Communist parties]. It would be hard to imagine any way of linking Cuba more closely to the Eastern bloc or of strengthening that bloc to the detriment of the West than the wholehearted support of this statement.'"

Guevara was in Moscow in December as head of a mission seeking trade relations that could prove decisive in preventing American imperialism from strangling the Cuban economy. He would have been a strange human and still stranger diplomat not to have felt gratitude for the timely

aid the Soviet bloc countries granted Cuba. So that the reader can judge for himself how "crazy" Guevara actually was in expressing his gratitude, here is the relevant section of a report he made over the air on his return:

Guevara's Report

"Mr. Gregorio Ortega: Major, in your trip through the socialist countries you happened to be at the meeting of eighty-one Communist and workers' parties. They issued a declaration and an appeal. I understand that you made some statements about this historic meeting which reached us only in part over the cables.

"What can you tell us about this declaration and this appeal?"

"Dr. Guevara: Well, the truth is that I didn't speak about the declaration, but only supported with enthusiasm the part in which Cuba was mentioned and cited as a shining example for the Americas. And, in addition, the fact that it was mentioned four times in this declaration, of the capital importance which an event of this character has: the meeting of the Communist countries of the whole world.

"For us, really, it was an important happening, a thing worthy of pride, to see the importance which was given to the Cuban Revolution, which is considered one of the most outstanding phenomena of the world today and perhaps, after the Chinese Revolution, the most important event that has occurred in the world in the struggle against the imperialist powers.

"There was simply a gathering at the Hall of the Trade Unions of the Soviet Union, a traditional hall where foreign visitors can speak. We didn't develop anything

but the theme as to why, in our estimation, Cuba was the example for the Americas . . .

"We said there at that time that Cuba was an example because of the form in which it had developed its struggle and because it had interpreted the situation perfectly when the time came to bring forth the Revolution. We believe that there are three fundamental contributions which the Cuban Revolution has already made, things that are not new, which have taken place in other countries, too, but which we put into practice for the first time in the Americas and which we rediscovered, not having had an exact, theoretical understanding of what others had contributed."

The "three fundamental contributions," according to Guevara, are the creation of an "insurrectional focus," the basing of revolutions in Latin America "fundamentally on the peasant classes," and, on coming to power, the destruction of the armed forces constructed by the ruling classes.

Did Guevara do wrong in Moscow to speak of the Cuban revolutionary experience along such lines and to expound its significance, as he saw it, for other countries, particularly those in Latin America? As a politician of completely different stripe, Draper is, of course, entitled to take a dim view of the pride Guevara displayed in Moscow over the Cuban Revolution, but doesn't a reader have a right to expect at least a reasonably accurate report of what the representative of the Cuban government said in Moscow?

Theodore Draper's analysis of the course of events in the Cuban

* *Obra Revolucionaria*, January 6, 1961, p. 25.

revolution suffers from a defect that has no rational explanation if you consider his approach to be objective and scientific—he leaves out the role of American imperialism as a cause for the radicalization of the revolution.

Our learned historian might be dealing with the world as it was before Columbus discovered America for all you will learn from him about such provocative actions as the slashing and then ending of the sugar quota, the imposition of an economic blockade on Cuba, the crescendo of insults, proddings and aggressions under auspices of the State Department and Central Intelligence Agency, and the ominous current preparations under American military advisers for armed invasion of the small island.

What political ends does this singular omission serve?

Instructive Parallel

In seeking the answer, I suggest a careful comparison of Draper's pamphlet, *Castro's Cuba — A Revolution Betrayed?*, which appeared in the *New Leader* of March 27 and the State Department "White Paper" on Cuba which was released April 3 and reprinted in next morning's *New York Times*. The State Department document was drafted by Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr., former Harvard historian, with the "cooperation of Richard Goodwin," according to E. W. Kenworthy of the *New York Times*, and was "written in the White House under the close direction of President Kennedy." James Reston reports in the April 5 *New York Times* that Kennedy "approved the State Department's White Paper on Cuba after consultation with Secretary of State Rusk and the head of the Cen-

tral Intelligence Agency, Allen Dulles . . ."

The line of this piece of State Department propaganda is startlingly close to the line of Draper's pamphlet. Like Draper, the White House team assiduously avoids mentioning the role of American imperialism, both past, present and projected, in relation to the Cuban revolution. The same key arguments as Draper's reach the same lulling conclusion; i.e., that the present warlike situation between Cuba and the United States is solely the fault of Fidel Castro. In fact the two pamphlets coincide so closely as to make perfect supplements.

This is not just my impression. On April 5 Max Lerner of the *New York Post* hailed the State Department "analysis and manifesto" as "an important event in the technique of American foreign policy." It's "part of a new diplomacy of the intellectuals," a diplomacy aimed at the intellectuals in Cuba and the rest of Latin America.

And here's the word on Draper. "To complete the Schlesinger analysis," said the *Post* columnist, "I strongly urge you to read a long article by Theodore Draper — 'Castro's Cuba: A Revolution Betrayed?' . . . makes mincemeat of the recent books on Cuba by C. Wright Mills, Paul Sweezy and Leo Huberman . . . We still need a good book on Cuba, but until it comes the Draper and Schlesinger analysis are the best available."

Schlesinger and Draper omit the aggressive role of American imperialism because Allen Dulles' propaganda smokescreen requires it. Once this is left out of consideration, the defensive reaction of the Cuban Revolutionary Government loses its reason and ap-

pears pure madness. In such "analysis," everything is conveniently reduced to what *Bohemia Libre*, a counterrevolutionary magazine described by Draper as "the edition in exile of Cuba's most famous magazine," calls Castro's "paranoia"; or, as Draper phrases it for the audience he is shooting at, "my worst apprehensions have come true," Fidel Castro pushed "too hard, too fast, and too far" and "has given Cuba not a national revolution but an international civil war."

The Real Crime

To omit the relation between American imperialism and the Cuban revolution has other conveniences, particularly in trying to make out that Castro "betrayed" the Cuban revolution; that is, turned away from the kind of democracy approved by the counterrevolution, the State Department and Theodore Draper, and moved toward socialist-type institutions.

By dwelling on the limitations of democracy in Cuba, whether real, imagined or imputed, these odd champions of democracy in the area between Haiti and Florida seek to divert attention from a crime against democratic rights that should make every American writhe over his country's role in world affairs. That is the crime of seeking to smash the Revolutionary Government, thereby denying the Cuban people the right to freely choose for themselves what form of government they want. By intervening in Cuba's internal affairs, by trying to strangle Cuba economically, by encouraging, financing, abetting and arming the counterrevolution, American imperialism violates Cuba's national sovereignty, the main democratic right of any people.

Draper participates in this foul game of imperialist politics by maintaining that the real question at issue is *Cuban* democracy. That's after sixty years of American imperialist domination that imposed some of the cruelest dictatorships in Latin-American history on the Cuban people. And with allies like dictator Chiang Kai-shek, Generalissimo Franco, the "towering" de Gaulle and the indescribable little butcher Tshombe who murdered Patrice Lumumba!

The Cubans are completely justified in dismissing the imperialist chatter about democracy in Cuba as nothing but war propaganda. They are right to demand of every American who raises the issue to please present his credentials in fighting McCarthyism — a test Kennedy, among others, cannot meet.

The Cubans score unanswerable points when they call attention to the way the most elementary democratic rights of Negroes and other minorities are denied and abused in the United States in contrast to the way they are respected in Cuba.

Every civil libertarian must wince when the Cubans note state election laws in "free" America that operate to bar minority parties from the ballot and federal regulations that deny minority candidates equal free time on the air.

And so you can continue, making an inventory of the American Way of Life showing that a great erosion of democracy has occurred, that militarism is on the rise, and that there is now a vicious latent tendency toward totalitarianism which makes itself known from time to time in the formation of such fascistlike groups as the John

Birch Society. Too bad that a historian of Draper's caliber responds to the unworthy compulsion to leave rich powerful America out of consideration when he thinks it politically advantageous to discuss democracy in poverty-stricken, beleaguered little Cuba!

Nevertheless someone who has proved himself on all these fronts, and perhaps believes in socialism as well, may say, "That's all very true. Still, just among ourselves, don't you think Draper made some telling points? For instance, what about Castro's failure to build a political party, and his letting the Rebel Army and the 26th of July Movement die on the vine? Isn't the Communist party moving into power and isn't Castro guilty of a one-man dictatorship? What about elections? How can the workers and peasants exercise democratic control over the government without elections?"

True Frame of Discussion

I will admit without the least hesitation that Cuba bears little resemblance to the democratic paradise to be found in Draper's head, if nowhere else on earth. Cuba is being badgered and bullied by the mightiest imperialist power on earth and threatened with a counterrevolutionary invasion in which the Pentagon and the Central Intelligence Agency are deeply involved. The CIA missionaries are out to shove democracy down the throats of the Cubans at the point of a machine gun the way they shoved it down the throats of the Guatemalans in 1954 when Carlos Castillo Armas restored United Fruit to power.

The odds are greater against the Cuban people than they were against the Yugoslavs when they faced German imperialism, yet

they have vowed to fight to the death for the freedom they won at such cost. They really believe in the democratic right to self-determination! They have taken up arms much like our American revolutionary forefathers. Struggles like that, involving civil war, are notoriously hard on the forms of democratic civil life; the rules and laws of war come into operation.

This constitutes the true frame for discussing Cuban democracy. How then can Draper be honestly credited with a single telling point about Cuban democracy when he does not even start with the first requisite for a meeting of minds—the unconditional defense of Cuba against counterrevolutionary and imperialist attack? To blame Castro for departing from the norms of democracy in organizing the defense of Cuba's democratic right to national sovereignty is not only unjust, it is a way of evading the real issues and covering up and excusing the worst enemies of Cuban democracy — and of American democracy for that matter.

Let us consider more closely several of the principal charges of the State Department propagandists.

"The history of the Castro revolution," say the Dulles-Rusk-Kennedy - Goodwin - Schlesinger harmony five, with a succinctness which soloist Draper might profitably study, "has been the history of the calculated destruction of the free-spirited rebel army and its supersession as the main military instrumentality of the regime by the new state militia.

"It has been the history of the calculated destruction of the 26th of July Movement and its supersession as the main political instrumentality of the regime by the

Communist party (Partido Socialista Popular)."

What the Facts Show

This is doctored history. Draper has assembled a few facts that will help us to show this.

First, let's get an idea of the size of the Rebel Army and the 26th of July Movement: "In the mountains at this time [April 1958, less than nine months before the revolutionary victory], Mills was told, the armed men under Castro numbered only about 300. Four months later, in August 1958, the two columns commanded by Majors Guevara and Camilo Cienfuegos, entrusted with the mission of cutting the island in two, the biggest single rebel operation of the entire struggle, amounted, according to Guevara, to 220 men. Sartre was informed that the total number of *barbudos* in all Cuba from beginning to end was only 3,000." These forces suffered a high rate of casualties. "Sartre was told that Batista's Army and police killed 1,000 *barbudos* in the last clashes in the mountains . . ."

Of course hundreds of thousands of Cubans actively sympathized with the *barbudos*; but, as the fighting cadres of the revolution staking their lives on the outcome, they constituted a very small force. This was not Castro's fault. To construct even this body of revolutionaries under the Batista dictatorship was a remarkable achievement.

What about their political quality? The young ones — that is, the great majority — were only at the beginning of their political education. This was true not only of the ranks but of the leaders as well. The following estimate, made

* Castro's Cuba—A Revolution Betrayed? p. 8.

by Draper last year, gives us an intimation: "Long after the rebellion in the Sierra Maestra had taken hold, Castro did not head a homogeneous movement, and the larger it grew, the less homogeneous it became. It included those who merely wished to go back to the democratic constitution of 1940 and those who demanded 'a real social revolution.' It included some who were friendly to the United States and some who hated it. It included anti-Communists and fellow travelers."*

A variegated initial political formation of this kind would have undergone internal differentiation, with subsequent splits and possibly fusions with other forces, even in normal times. The revolutionary process accelerated this development and the counterrevolutionary pressure of American imperialism gave it a breakneck pace. The main direction of the class struggle favored the wing that demanded "a real social revolution."

This evolution toward the left, a typical phenomenon of every revolution, was not a "betrayal" but the political reflection of a deep shift of class forces in Cuba. Of course the apologists and defenders of American imperialism are not concerned with analysis here; they are simply engaging in invidious epithet, an ancient custom among war propagandists.

What happened to the *barbudos* after the victory? A remarkable blindness afflicts the writers in the State Department stables. Draper mentions in "The Runaway Revolution" that 764 co-operatives had been formed when he visited Cuba and 500 more were in the planning stage in the cane lands.

* "The Runaway Revolution." The Reporter, May 12, 1960.

Describing "how the system works," he tells about a rice co-operative he visited near the town of Bayamo. After listing the various projects, he notes: "The 'administrator' was a former rebel fighter who had been an ordinary day laborer." The significance of this fact escapes him. To staff each of the co-operatives with a single *barbudo* like this one would require the majority of cadres who survived the struggle against Batista!

We, if not Draper, can appreciate Guevara's dry comment, after the big nationalizations of last fall, on the impracticality — aside from the political inadvisability — of the government taking over the 150,000 really small individual businesses in Cuba. "Just to get 500 interveners for the factories we had to break our heads, and every day we have to replace someone who doesn't work out!"*

A less resolute, less self-confident leadership would have felt defeated even before it started the gigantic task of staffing the government and the institutions that grew out of the revolution. The fact is that the *barbudos* worked around the clock, sometimes until they dropped and had to be carried out on stretchers, in the first months after the victory. The dissemination of the cadres into the sea of tasks confronting the Revolutionary Government is termed by the State Department propagandists "calculated destruction." They make up for this, of course, by pinning "hero" badges on those that were really destroyed — the small number who turned traitor.

It is quite gratuitous to explain to the Cuban leaders the value of

* Obra Revolucionaria, January 6, 1961. p. 29.

a party big enough and capable enough to undertake with smoothness the tremendous revolutionary tasks facing the country. They know from hard experience the value of such a party, how it would have facilitated the struggle for power, what an enormous difference it would make now in solving current problems. But that's not the kind of party the State Department advises for Cuba.

Draper, who knows all there is to know about building a revolutionary party except its practice, condemns Castro for allegedly blocking formation of a party that would properly measure up to the Cuban revolution. This is all the more ludicrous in view of the evident maturing of conditions in Cuba for the appearance of a mass revolutionary-socialist party.

Two developments indicate the trend. The first is the formation of the militia.

We have seen how the State Department views the organization of the militia as part of the "calculated destruction of the free-spirited rebel army." Draper uses the epithets "amorphous," "impersonal" and "anonymous" to describe the armed people. This strange historian, in his babbling over the perilous state of democracy in Cuba, is capable of forgetting that America's revolutionary founders considered a militia such an important feature of democracy that they listed it as Article II in the Bill of Rights, next to freedom of religion, speech, the press and right of petition. To save Draper researching it, here is what the Constitution declares: "A well-regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed."

If we judge by this criterion of democracy, Cuba under Castro is a free state; America, which has today adopted the Prussian military system, is not. Shouldn't Draper, as a firebrand of democracy, agitate for the militia system in the United States and, for instance, the free distribution of arms to Negroes in Mississippi?

The militia, as a democratic institution of the most fundamental kind, provides a great arena, involving hundreds of thousands of the most patriotic Cubans, for the development of a revolutionary-socialist consciousness, the main requirement for the formation of the kind of party Cuba needs. Didn't Draper listen to the political talks that accompanied the militia drills he witnessed when he visited Cuba? Evidently not. In Draper's humble opinion, even Castro "makes virtually the same speech every time"; why listen to mere rank-and-file revolutionary cadres explain the revolution to units of an armed population the length and breadth of the island?

No McCarthyism in Cuba

The other important development pointing the direction of politics in Cuba was the firm stand taken by the Revolutionary Government against any imitation of McCarthyism. This defense of freedom of thought cost the defection of such "anti-Communist" figures as Luis Conte Agüero, for whom Draper shed a few sympathetic tears last year. But by refusing to join in the "anti-Communist" crusade which has been such a blight in American politics since 1948, the Revolutionary Government opened the possibility for a new realignment of radical political tendencies in Cuba. The

principal grouping affected by this is, of course, the Communist party.

To the propagandists of American imperialism, this, naturally, was nothing less than "betrayal" of the Cuban revolution, for which, of all the revolutions on its calendar, Dulles' Central Intelligence Agency has the most tender concern.

By refusing to deny the Communist party its democratic rights the way they are denied in "free" America, Castro failed to conform to the loyalty standards of the House Un-American Activities Committee. However, this was not equivalent to agreeing with the politics of the Communist party, as the witch-hunters would have us believe; it was a principled stand in defense of democracy.

The Cuban Communist party rallied to the revolution; while the bourgeois parties, under guise of fighting the "inroads of communism," began organizing the counterrevolution in conspiracy with a hostile foreign power, thereby placing themselves outside any legitimate claim to democratic rights under the Revolutionary Government.

The witch-hunters and their dupes picture the Cuban Communist party as a totalitarian force rolling like a Soviet tank to power, if it does not already "dominate the government" as the State Department claims. The truth is quite different.

Revolutionary Pressure

This party, like other Communist parties, is favorably affected by the melting of the great iceberg of Stalinism, which began with the Soviet triumph in World War II and continued with the Yugoslav revolt, the victory of the Chinese revolution and the shat-

tering of the cult of Stalin. The running ideological differences between Moscow, Peking and Belgrade prevent the party from reverting to the deadly sterility of thought so characteristic of such parties in the thirties and forties. In addition — and this is decisive for the fate of the Cuban Communist party — the members are under the influence of a great, successful revolution that broke over their heads and in which they must now prove themselves. They are subject to two sources of enormous revolutionary pressure, masses on the move and the radical Castro leadership which demonstrated once and for all that you don't need a Stalinist background or Moscow advice or backing to topple a tyrant and set out on the road to a planned economy.

Viewed with cold objectivity, it is clear that the Cuban Communist party is not a contestant for power but is instead one of the main components of a potential new political movement whose ultimate shape is yet to be determined. The chances are excellent that what will finally emerge in Cuba is a mass party with a revolutionary-socialist program.

This will scarcely meet with the approval of the Central Intelligence Agency experts on party building in Cuba. What the cloak-and-dagger crew would like to see is a party in power committed to capitalist property relations and — in due time — "democratic elections." Since they are unable to get it any other way, they now propose to brush all democratic considerations aside, shoot their way in and set up a puppet dictator like Castillo Armas of Guatemala.

The State Department slanders

Castro in accusing him of totalitarianism. Castro's basic outlook is deeply democratic. He proved this in the most decisive way by taking an overturn in property relations as the key to extending democracy on the widest possible scale. This is one of the real reasons why Washington regards him with such hate. The imperialist rulers of America are afraid that if Cuba is left alone, if it is permitted to enjoy normal economic and diplomatic relations with the United States, the Revolutionary Government will soon set such an example of democracy in action that the American people would not be long in saying, "That's real democracy! We are entitled to some of that in America, too."

Against the efforts to smash the Castro regime, American supporters of democracy, in defending the democratic right of the Cubans to self-determination, have every reason to put extra vehemence in the cry, "Hands off Cuba!"

State Department Thesis

The central thesis of the State Department's "White Paper" is that Castro "betrayed" the Cuban revolution. Section III is headed: "The Delivery of the Revolution to the Sino-Soviet Bloc." We are informed in this section that arms "have poured from beyond the Iron Curtain into Cuba" and that trade and financial agreements have "integrated the Cuban economy with that of the Communist world," 75 per cent of Cuban trade now going in that direction.

"The artificiality of this development is suggested," the White House authors blandly assert, "by the fact that at the beginning of 1960 only 2 per cent of Cuba's total foreign trade was with the Communist bloc."

The "White Paper" does not even mention that Washington cut off all sugar imports from Cuba in 1960 and then imposed a virtually total trade embargo on the island. What were the Cubans supposed to do in face of Washington's artificial political decision to stop all American businessmen from trading with them? Sit down in the shade of a royal palm and quietly starve to death while offering up thanks to Eisenhower and Kennedy for this American aid in speeding them on to a better world?

The Cuban government exercised its democratic right as a sovereign power to trade where it could on the world market. To have done otherwise would have been a real betrayal of the revolution.

The complaint about arms purchases is even more outrageous. Operating with seemingly unlimited funds from mysterious sources, the Cuban counterrevolutionaries, with the connivance of the Pentagon and the Central Intelligence Agency, opened up recruiting agencies for mercenaries throughout the United States, set up training camps in various areas, armed themselves to the teeth and began invasion preparations by dropping incendiary mechanisms from Florida-based planes and by planting bombs in Cuba's big cities. What should the Cubans have done in the face of this "international civil war," as Draper calls it — bare their throats and say, "Please don't spoil my hair by cutting past my ears"?

In these circumstances does acceptance of aid wherever it can be obtained signify "Delivery of the Revolution to the Sino-Soviet Bloc"? According to that kind of

reasoning, George Washington delivered the American revolution to imperial France because he accepted aid from Louis XVI and Marie Antoinette. We can see his historian Draper, who at that time hung around the court of George III, beating his wig in anguish over such "treachery." The Americans were clearly "betraying" the anti-French and anti-Indian cause for which they had fought with the British in the French and Indian War not so long before.

But the practical, democratic-minded American revolutionaries took a different attitude toward French aid in their struggle for freedom from British tyranny. In fact American gratitude was so lasting that almost a century and a half later in World War I the most popular slogan the propagandists could think up to cover the landing of American troops in France was "Lafayette, we are here!"

On the other hand, Americans who remained loyal to the crown, Benedict Arnolds who sold out their country's cause, and the Hessian mercenaries who were hired by the British to fight the rebellious colonials are held in deserved infamy to this day.

Did They "Betray"?

As another "proof" of its central thesis, the State Department claims that "so far as the expressed political aims of the revolution were concerned, the record of the Castro regime has been a record of the steady and consistent betrayal of Dr. Castro's pre-revolutionary promises . . ." Draper declares that "Castro promised one kind of revolution and made another. The revolution Castro promised was unquestionably betrayed."

To substantiate his point, Draper has compiled "a brief inventory" of typical declarations made by Castro between 1953 and 1958. They indicate that Castro did not envision going beyond bourgeois-democratic measures and that he specifically favored "free enterprise and invested capital" and rejected "wholesale nationalization." In taking over Cuban and American capitalist holdings, the Revolutionary Government clearly went far beyond bourgeois-democratic measures.

By disregarding the economic, social and political pressures that forced this course, in particular those emanating from Wall Street and the State Department, Draper "unquestionably" has no difficulty in picturing Castro as having "betrayed" the revolution; that is, assuming leadership and responsibility for undertaking measures that went beyond and even conflicted with the original concepts of the revolutionary leaders.

As a professional historian, Draper, you might imagine, would realize that Castro is not the only revolutionary figure he is accusing of "betrayal" for permitting himself to be pushed forward by the revolutionary process. Here is a brief inventory for his consideration:

- In 1774 John Adams wrote that independence was "a Hobgoblin of so frightful mien, that it would throw a delicate Person into Fits to look it in the Face." Later he was a leader in the fight for adoption of the Declaration of Independence.

- In March 1775 Benjamin Franklin testified in London that he had never heard in America one word in favor of independence "from any person, drunk or sober."

● Even after the Battle of Lexington, George Washington told his Tory friend Jonathan Boucher that if ever he heard of Washington's joining in any such measures as the colonies separating from England, Boucher "had his leave to set him down for everything wicked."

● More than two months after the Battle of Bunker Hill, Thomas Jefferson, author of the Declaration of Independence, wrote in a private letter that he was "looking with fondness toward a reconciliation with Great Britain."

● The delegates to the First Continental Congress which met in the autumn of 1774 assured the King: "Your royal authority over us and our connection with Great Britain we shall always carefully and zealously endeavor to support and maintain."

● In 1775 the Second Continental Congress, while setting forth colonial grievances, explicitly assured "our friends and fellow subjects in any part of the Empire . . . that we mean not to dissolve that union which had so long and so happily subsisted between us, and which we sincerely wish to see restored." One year and two days later the same Congress issued the Declaration of Independence.

Is this contrast between the convictions of one stage and the actions of the next to be accepted by the court as damning evidence of "revolutionary schizophrenia," as Draper labels comparable phenomena in the Cuban revolution? Tom Paine, one of the leading promoters of the American independence movement, saw it more clearly. In "The American Crisis" he wrote: "Independence was a doctrine scarce and rare,

even towards the conclusion of the year 1775; all our politics had been founded on the expectation of making the matter up . . ."

Similar brief inventories could be drawn up for other revolutionary struggles. For instance, although he disliked slavery personally, Abraham Lincoln publicly pledged that the slaveholders need not fear a Republican administration. "We must not interfere with the institution of slavery in the states where it exists, because the Constitution forbids it and the general welfare does not require us to do so." As late as September 1861 he told a group of anti-slavery Republicans: "We didn't go into the war to put down slavery, but to put the flag back; and to act differently at this moment would, I have no doubt, not only weaken our cause, but smack of bad faith."

A year later, in view of the crisis in prosecution of the war, Lincoln overturned property relations in the South. He freed the slaves despite his public commitment to the contrary. We look forward with interest to Theodore Draper's history of the Civil War exposing Honest Abe, the Great Emancipator, as Bad Faith Abe, the Great Betrayer.

Preconceptions Affect Analysis

Historian Draper's forgetfulness of some major lessons of history is probably not due to any tendency to underrate the importance of facts — at least in his two volumes on the history of the American Communist party he showed sufficient respect for them

* The above quotations are taken from "The Movement for American Independence" by William F. Warde in *Fourth International*, July-August, 1950. This article offers an illuminating discussion of the lag between revolutionary consciousness and revolutionary events.

to let the record speak pretty much for itself. In the case of Cuba arbitrary preconceptions which he holds affect his selection and arrangement of facts. His "theory" dominates his analysis.

"How could a revolution basically middle-class in nature be turned against that class?" Draper asks. "How could a revolution made without the official Communists and for the most part despite them become so intimately linked with them? How, in short, could Fidel Castro promise one revolution and make another, and what consequences flowed from this revolutionary schizophrenia?"*

The Cuban revolution, Draper answers, "belongs to a new type of system, neither capitalist nor socialist, that emerges where capitalism has not succeeded and socialism cannot succeed." According to this view, there is something inherent in the revolution itself that makes it go wrong and compels a leader like Castro to "betray." Naturally, if what is wrong is *inherent* in the revolution, the field of research is correspondingly narrowed and the relation of American imperialism is irrelevant. Even if the White House had remained friendly and the State Department had pumped aid into Cuba instead of attempting ruthlessly to bring down the economy and the new government, Castro would have "betrayed."

What is this inherent poison or congenital disease in the Cuban revolution? Where "capitalism has been successful," Draper tells us, no "impoverished, class-conscious proletariat exists." Therefore, in countries like the United States

* Castro's Cuba — A Revolution Betrayed? In the *New Leader* March 27, 1961. Unless otherwise noted, all quotations from Draper are from this source.

which have the technological base for socialism, no socialist revolution can occur.

Where capitalism has not been successful, Draper continues, no "advanced industrial economy" exists that could support a socialist structure as conceived by Marx. However, in the latter areas, the middle class, faced with poverty and lack of opportunity, revolts and turns irresistibly toward the ideology of socialism. "They cannot be faithful to the fundamental ideas of the socialist tradition — that the proletariat should liberate itself, that there are prerequisites of socialism, especially an advanced industrial economy, and that socialism must fulfill and complement political democracy." But they "can find in Marxism an ideological sanction for the unrestricted and unlimited use of the state to change the social order, and they can find in Leninism a sanction for *their* unrestricted and unlimited power over the state."

Sees New "Family"

The result of a revolution under these conditions, Draper contends, is something qualitatively different from either capitalism or socialism. "The order of development cannot be inverted — first the revolution, then the prerequisites of socialism — without resulting in a totally different kind of social order, alien to the letter and, infinitely more, to the spirit of socialism. These inverted revolutions from above belong to what, for want of a better word, we must call the Communist family of revolutions, which, in practice, serve to industrialize the peasantry rather than to liberate the proletariat."

For about 30 years there was only the Russian variant, Draper

continues. Then in 1948 came the "Titoist variant." In late 1949, the "Chinese variant." "Now a new branch of the family has begun to emerge." These are national-revolutionary movements that begin under figures like Nkrumah in Ghana, Sékou Touré in Guinea or Fidel Castro in Cuba, but soon fall prey to Communism. Since local Communists are, in the beginning, no match for such leaders, they were "advised to bide their time." "First the national-revolutionary movement could win power, then the Communists could win power in the national-revolutionary movements." And that, in effect, is what has been happening in this world of ours.

Having read this, you have read about all of Theodore Draper on this subject. His articles on Cuba offer little more than the dust caught in the bag of this theoretical vacuum cleaner.

Draper's Advice

The sterile and reactionary character of the politics entailed by this theory is striking. I could find only two sentences in the entire pamphlet suggesting an alternative to nationalizing industry in Cuba and introducing economic planning: "After World War II, Cuban interests were strong enough to buy a substantial share of U.S.-owned sugar production which fell from 70-80 per cent of the total at its high point in the 1930s to about 35 per cent in 1958. Government encouragement of 'Cubanization' would easily have cut the figure in half again in a short time under a post-Batista democratic regime." In short, Draper's advice, for what it is worth, is that Castro should have encouraged "free enterprise" in Cuba.

Back of that program lurks two postulates: (1) National capital in countries like Cuba is capable of successfully competing in the modern world with imperialist capitalism on the one hand and the system of planned economies on the other. (2) Imperialist capitalism is preferable to a "new type of system" that is presumably "neither capitalist nor socialist."

If these postulates are true no rational explanation exists for the great wave of anti-capitalist and anti-imperialist revolutions in the world today. Everything ends up in the "paranoia" of a demagogue. But why paranoia should prove so attractive and politically efficacious among hundreds of millions of poverty-stricken people remains a book sealed with seven seals.

Other oddities follow as logical consequences from Draper's preconceptions. He equates the anti-Semitic — and "anti-Communist"! — mass demonstrations engineered by Hitler and Mussolini with the anti-imperialist crowds that gather to hear Castro. He equates the cult of Trujillo, a puppet of American imperialism, with the popularity of Castro, who stands in the eyes of millions of Latin Americans like a David against Goliath; and he sees little difference between Trujillo's "neo-democracy" and the beginnings of proletarian democracy in Cuba. He equates Stalin's purge of the Old Bolsheviks, a phase of the degeneration of the Russian revolution, with Castro's moving beyond the initial program of the 26th of July Movement, a phase of the rise of the Cuban revolution. Draper, criticizing red-baiter Nathaniel Weyl, the author of *Red Star Over Cuba*, declares: "Communists, ex-Communists, non-

Communists and opportunists are indiscriminately lumped together. Every bit of evidence that does not fit the book's thesis is ruthlessly suppressed or glossed over. All the hard problems of Castro's political developments are oversimplified and vulgarized." It's a fair, if not perfect, description of Draper's own analysis.

Under compulsion of the same logic, Draper is unable to see that the working class or peasantry played much of a role in the Cuban revolution. Batista fell, we are told, because the middle class deserted him. This was due, Draper argues, to Castro's "guerrilla tactics" which "aimed not so much at 'defeating' the enemy as at inducing him to lose his head, fight terror with counterterror on the largest possible scale, and make life intolerable for the ordinary citizen." (What class does that "ordinary citizen" belong to?) We are then given this priceless pearl: "The same terror that Castro used against Batista is now being used against Castro. And Castro has responded with counterterror, just as Batista did." Thus Castro = Batista. Q.E.D. History is reduced to terrorist bomb-throwing.

A Bomb Is a Bomb

But worse than the old-time anarchists, who distinguished between the terror of reaction and the terror of the self-sacrificing idealist, Draper draws no distinction. A bomb is a bomb and any bomb is equal to any other, if not sometimes more. Draper, who thus takes the democratic outlook to its ultimate absurdity, complains about C. Wright Mills's lack of sociological imagination. How carping can you get?

This happens to be the theory back of the counterrevolution's

hopes for an easy victory over the Revolutionary Government. Since the inert and unthinking masses of workers and peasants play no part in Cuban politics and since a section of the middle class has now deserted Castro, it follows that a few mad bombers prowling among the Sunday crowds can prove sufficient to induce the leaders of the revolution to lose their heads, "fight terror with counterterror" and thus open the way for the restoration of the landholders and capitalists to their properties. They probably found the theory in a book of useful household hints — "How to Cork a Volcano."

The counterrevolutionary mercenaries would be well advised to ponder the following observation made by Theodore Draper last year: "No matter what one may think of the theory behind Cuba's land-reform program and no matter how the program turns out in practice, there is no getting around the fact that for the poor, illiterate, landless outcast *guajiros*, the co-operatives represent a jump of centuries in living standards. They also represent a vast increase of constructive activity in the rural areas that were formerly the most backward and stagnant part of Cuba."*

Will these *guajiros* prove inert to the plot to return them to the backwardness and stagnation of past centuries? I. F. Stone, who has a more vivid sociological imagination than Draper, said after a recent visit to Cuba: "Guerrillas who offer peasants aid against a hated landlord or village usurer are one thing. But can you see a U.S. guerrilla knocking on a peasant's door late at night,

* "The Runaway Revolution." *The Reporter*, May 12, 1960.

'Give me water; hide me; I bring a message from United Fruit Company; we've come to take back your land.'?"

"Permanent Revolution"

The tendency for a bourgeois revolution to transcend its bourgeois-democratic limits, that is, proceed toward socialistic forms of property, was noted by Marx and Engels in the upsurge they participated in as young men. In fact they began their revolutionary careers as bourgeois democrats and ended as the founders of scientific socialism. It was not until the appearance of Leon Trotsky, however, that this tendency received rounded theoretical development. As early as 1904, the youth who was to become co-leader of the 1917 Russian Revolution had reached that deep insight into the main course of the revolutions of our time which was to win him world recognition as one of the greatest of revolutionary theoreticians. He named his theoretical contribution the "Permanent Revolution," taking the title from the following suggestive declarations made by Marx and Engels in an Address of the Central Committee to the Communist League, dated March 1850:

"While the democratic petty bourgeois wish to bring the revolution to a conclusion as quickly as possible, and with the achievement, at most, of the above [reform] demands, it is our interest and our task to make the revolution permanent, until all more or less possessing classes have been forced out of their position of dominance, until the proletariat has conquered state power, and the association of proletarians, not only in one country but in all the dominant coun-

tries of the world, has advanced so far that competition among the proletarians of these countries has ceased and that at least the decisive productive forces are concentrated in the hands of the proletarians. For us the issue cannot be the alteration of private property but only its annihilation, not the smoothing over of class antagonisms but the abolition of classes, not the improvement of existing society but the foundation of a new one." The battle cry of the workers must be, said the Address in conclusion: "The Revolution in Permanence."

The basis of Trotsky's theory was the uneven development of capitalism on a world scale. In the old capitalist centers technology is so advanced that society is rotten ripe for socialist reorganization. In the underdeveloped areas of the world, however, pre-capitalist relations are still strong, and the main revolutionary tasks are thus bourgeois in character. But the pattern of change does not simply repeat the pattern of the early bourgeois revolutions in which the working class was scarcely developed. The underdeveloped countries do not live in isolation from the rest of the world. In fact imperialist capitalism has penetrated them, bringing the most advanced technology. ("Brazil seems to have jumped from the ox cart to the age of the air," notes Charles Wagley, professor of anthropology at Columbia University; "... young Brazilians who have never driven an automobile have 'soloed' in the air.") And along with this, imperialism injects the most advanced class relations into the antiquated social structure. (Highly exploited sugar workers, for instance, in Cuba.) The working

class, even though it may be numerically thin, consequently has far greater political weight than its prototypes at the dawn of capitalism. When it enters the political arena, it tends to draw on the most advanced political thought of the world's great metropolitan centers. Together with backwardness, even primitiveness, is combined the very latest in scientific thought and achievement.

It is possible, therefore, for the working class, in alliance with the peasantry — which is pressing for bourgeois reforms in property relations on the land — to win political power in a backward country even sooner than in an advanced country. In power it has no choice but to proceed with the economic and social tasks inherent to its class position: expropriation of capital, building of a planned economy, etc. These are socialist in principle no matter how limited or distorted they may be in fact. The victory of the workers in such countries cannot be maintained, however, without the aid of the workers of the advanced centers; that is, without the extension or continuation of the revolution on an international scale, above all into the old capitalist powers.*

Through this theory, Trotsky was able to predict correctly the course of the 1917 Revolution in Russia, some twelve years before it occurred.

Interestingly enough, Lenin did not agree with Trotsky's prognosis. In 1905 Lenin wrote: "We cannot

* For an explanation by Trotsky himself of the theory, see *The Permanent Revolution, The History of the Russian Revolution*, or "Three Concepts of the Russian Revolution" in *Stalin—An Appraisal of the Man and His Influence*. These books are available in most libraries. (Or write Pioneer Publishers, 116 University Place, New York 3, N. Y.)

jump out of the bourgeois-democratic framework of the Russian Revolution, but we can considerably broaden that framework." He repeated this in innumerable articles and speeches year after year until after the February 1917 Revolution. Not until April of that year did he change his views. When he finally did change, it precipitated a crisis in the Bolshevik party, which was convinced that the revolution had only a bourgeois-democratic character as Lenin had repeatedly insisted. But Lenin's prestige was such that he succeeded in getting the party to adopt the new position despite the cries of capitulation to "Trotskyism."

It was on the solid basis of this shift, plus his own recognition of Lenin's correctness on the need for a democratic-centralist party, that Trotsky, together with his following, joined the Bolsheviks and helped the second revolution to emerge from the first one.

Only Rational Theory

Of course it can be argued, as it was at the time and has been perennially ever since, that the Bolsheviks did wrong in accepting power in an underdeveloped country like Russia. A book could be devoted to this topic alone. Aside from the "morality" of it all, the point is that Trotsky's theory of the permanent revolution enabled him to foresee with accuracy the actual main pattern of the Russian Revolution and that this theory offers the only rational explanation for such revolutions as the one in Cuba.

No utterly novel "new type of system" has emerged, as Draper maintains. Cuba has simply gone beyond capitalism in some important respects and begun to build

institutions that are basically socialist in principle. The country is in *transition* between capitalism and socialism. How long it remains in transition depends on international forces and events, primarily the ultimate fate of the old capitalist powers. When the United States goes socialist, Cuba will be among the first to benefit and will certainly complete the change-over in record time.

The question of the absence of direct proletarian leadership in the 1958-59 Cuban Revolution offers a complication it is true,* but on the main question—the tendency of a bourgeois-democratic revolution in an underdeveloped country to go beyond its bourgeois-democratic limits — Cuba offers once again the most striking confirmation of Trotsky's famous theory. That the Cuban revolutionaries were unaware they were confirming something seemingly so abstract and remote makes it all the more impressive.

The fact that these same revolutionaries, without knowing Trotsky's theory, proved capable of transcending their own limited previous political positions speaks

* On this see my articles, "Theory of the Cuban Revolution" in the *International Socialist Review*, Winter 1961, and "Ideology of the Cuban Revolution" in the Summer 1960 issue.

completely in their favor. It demonstrates that in caliber they belong to the great tradition of genuine revolutionary leaders, beginning with the leaders of our own American revolution.

Cuba is at present a fortress under siege by American imperialism. To offer to judge what goes on inside that fortress, without taking into account the siege, represents the utter prostration and abasement of theory. That Draper's preconceptions required him to do this is sufficient to discount his views completely.

The Cuban revolution is another link in the chain of revolutions going back to the Paris Commune of 1871 and the revolutionary upheavals of 1848. As such it has much in common with these revolutions although like all revolutions it has its own peculiarities. It offers great new lessons, above all on the pattern to be expected in other coming revolutions in Latin America. All of these revolutions, it can be predicted with absolute surety, will proceed from the bourgeois-democratic to the proletarian stage with extraordinary speed. If for no other reason, they will do this because American imperialism offers them no choice but death or permanent revolution.

Stop the Crime Against Cuba!

Statement by the Political Committee,
Socialist Workers Party

The Kennedy administration has launched an undeclared war on Cuba. This is the brutal fact now facing the American people.

No less an authority than the *New York Times* felt forced to admit in an editorial April 18, the day after the invasion: "It is also no secret that the United States Government has been helping the Cuban exiles over a period of many months with arms, training and facilities on American soil and in Guatemala. This has been too well publicized to be ignored today."

Khrushchev has appealed per-

sonally to Kennedy "to put an end to the aggression." The Soviet premier warned that "any so-called 'small war' can provoke a chain reaction in all parts of the world." He reaffirmed a pledge to help Cuba "in beating back the armed attack." Once again he stressed the interest of his government "in a relaxation of international tension." "But," he added, "if others aggravate it we shall reply in full measure."

This restrained indication of the possible consequences must be taken with utmost serious-

ness. If the Kennedy administration persists in its armed aggression, it can set in motion forces that will inevitably plunge humanity into nuclear war.

Let there be no mistake about the guilt. The Central Intelligence Agency, first under Eisenhower and then under Kennedy, financed and trained thousands of counterrevolutionary mercenaries. They were armed with U.S. naval, air and army weapons, including B-26 bombers and troop transports. Their invasion of Cuba was master-minded by American military experts in flagrant violation of the U.S. laws, including the Neutrality Act, and nonaggression treaties.

The crime against Cuba is also a crime against the American people. All Kennedy's talk about a "Peace Corps" and an "Alliance for Progress" in Latin America proved to be lying propaganda. It aimed at covering up the real plan of action — a new ordeal of terror and butchery for the Cuban people.

Kennedy's campaign promises about a "New Frontier" and world peace were directed primarily to the youth of America. But Kennedy is not teaching the ways of peace. The planting of phosphorous in the air-conditioning system of Havana's biggest department store is hailed as a heroic act. Corps of bomb-

ers are praised as champions of freedom and democracy. By this glorification of sabotage and indiscriminate terror, Kennedy is fostering in America's youth the type of mentality now on display in the Eichmann trial. Is this the "New Frontier"?

Like Eisenhower, Kennedy is acting for the economic and financial interests that stand behind the Democratic and Republican parties. These dealers in stocks and bonds bled Cuba for six decades, condemning the population to poverty, unemployment, illiteracy and endemic disease. They want back their lucrative holdings — no ifs, ands or buts. Besides that, they fear the Cuban example will inspire similar revolutions throughout Latin America. Their recipe is "Crush it in the bud."

The counterrevolutionary generals of the invasion army lie when they say they are fighting for "democracy" and the "liberation" of Cuba. Their sole aim is to make the island safe once again for the dollars of American investors.

This is proved by the key plank in their call for war against the Castro regime issued April 8 in Manhattan by Miró Cardona, head of the "Cuban Revolutionary Council" set up for recognition by the U.S. as the "government" of Cuba: "We emphatically assure those who have been unjustly dispossessed

that all of their assets will be returned . . . We shall encourage investment in private property, both national and foreign, and we shall give complete guarantees to private enterprise and to private property."

The Cuban revolutionists have followed an opposite course. In place of capitalist production for profit at the expense of human rights, they are building a planned economy.

In Cuba the long-standing army of unemployed has been greatly reduced and its liquidation is feasible in a year or two. Jim Crow was wiped out along with capitalism, its main supporting institution. Attractive, low-cost homes are being built by the thousands throughout the island in a great national effort to provide housing for everyone. Rents were slashed in half and now every tenant can become a home-owner, since rent is accepted by the government as installment payments on a house or apartment.

Landless peasants have received their own farms or else participate in co-operatives that have already made possible an impressive rise in national productivity. Illiteracy, which affected a third of the population in 1959, is now close to elimination, a two-year achievement no other country can match.

These are some of the gains in Cuba which Wall Street re-

gards as a mortal threat. The money-changers are right. Why should any people endure the domination of big monopolies when by kicking them out they can win such enormous improvements?

Wall Street's scheme is to correct things by overthrowing the government of Cuba the way the Central Intelligence Agency overthrew the lawfully elected government of Guatemala in 1954.

What is this mysterious CIA? What does it do with its enormous funds? To whom is it accountable?

All that the American people have been permitted to know is that the head of this spy agency is Allen Dulles and that it carries on "cloak and dagger" operations. Spying, it turns out, reaches the level of undeclared wars.

One courageous journalist, I. F. Stone, has asked why Allen Dulles is not indicted. A congressman alive to his responsibilities to the American people would go further and demand impeachment of Kennedy.

Many voices have demanded investigation of the CIA — investigation of its U-2 spy operations, its sinister efforts to get us into war in Laos, its recruitment of Cuban mercenaries, its training of saboteurs and terrorists, its construction of military training camps and secret

air bases in other countries, its access to the arsenals of the navy, the army and the air force to outfit an entire expeditionary force and keep it supplied in a war.

The American people are entitled to know exactly how this agency assembles foreign troops on American soil, how it transfers these mercenaries to other countries, how it lands them on the beaches of Cuba and supplies them with the matériel of war; and who pays for all this.

The crimes committed by American big business against Cuba since 1898 make a somber list. Instead of capping these crimes with the horrors of invasion and war, we should in simple justice offer the Cuban people all the help in our power.

Let's resume normal diplomatic and trade relations. Let's send delegations to study the successes of the Cubans and see

what we can learn from them. Instead of a policy of hatred toward Cuba, let's initiate a policy of friendship.

We firmly believe in the right of every people to choose whatever kind of government they want, free from any foreign pressure. We believe that the Cubans are entitled to exercise this basic democratic right. We call for solidarity with them in defending it.

We hope that every American who believes in the equality of nations will join in picketing and demonstrating for this right or will indicate to Congress and the White House by other means how he feels.

End the aggression against Cuba at once! End the economic blockade! End the policy of trying to isolate and crush the Cuban Revolution! Hands off Cuba!

April 19, 1961

Speech at the United Nations

Excerpts from Dr. Paul Roa's Charges

(The following are excerpts of the April 17 United Nations speech by Cuban Foreign Minister Raul Roa detailing the facts about the Washington-sponsored invasion of Cuba.)

I must announce officially . . . that the Republic of Cuba was invaded this morning by a mercenary force which came from Guatemala and Florida and which was organized, financed and armed by the Government of the United States of America . . .

The Government of the United States had closed both eyes and ears to the denunciation and the proof given by the Revolutionary government, while it coldly denied the facts, ended the sugar quota, declared an economic blockade, sent planes and weapons to Cuba, distributed millions of dollars to the mercenaries, pressured the counterrevolutionary groups to unify, and compelled them to constitute a government in exile, violating its own laws of neutrality . . .

Can the representatives of the United States here deny the exist-

ence of counterrevolutionary camps in the Florida peninsula under command of Americans, with impunity given by United States authorities and financed by United States dollars? . . .

The Revolutionary Government of Cuba knows — and can the United States representative deny this? — that the CIA is a body directed toward subversion against Cuba and spends about a half a million dollars a month on preparations for invasion. This has been shown in black and white in *Time*, the *United States News & World Report*, in the *Baltimore Sun*, and in the *Miami Herald* of April 14, where it stated that the United States is spending \$17,000 a day only to maintain four or five main bases in Central America, stating that the costs are high because the mercenaries are well clad, well shod, well fed and well equipped. The Revolutionary Government knows full well — and can the representative of the United States deny it? — that one of the main bases of the pirate planes is in the hands of and belongs to

the Marines, that it is located at Opa-Locka, Florida, and that it was chosen because it is inactive.

The United States government is so committed to this conspiracy that it has stopped all denials. The patriotic decision of the Cuban people to win or die has provoked a great loss of composure in Washington

I shall not tax the attention of the representatives with a full statement of the American weapons captured in the course of the present Administration's existence in Washington. This inventory is at the disposal of the representatives themselves if they wish to see it. The delegation of Cuba feels that it would be well for the representative of the United States rather to answer some questions.

May I be allowed to illustrate this series of questions with photographic proof that I will hold up so that the Committee may see it. [At this point Dr. Roa displayed photos of U.S. matériel captured in Cuba.] The delegation of Cuba, I repeat, feels that it would be useful if the representative of the United States were to reply to these questions.

Is it or is it not true that these anti-tank guns, 57 mm. guns, manufactured by the Firestone Corporation, which were dropped by planes in Escambray, can be only sold through treaties between governments?

Is it or is it not true that these 30-calibre carbines, M-1, manufactured by the IBM Corporation, are those used by the Marine infantry of the United States as a substitute for the 45-calibre Thompson automatic rifle?

Is it or is it not true that this type of transmitter and receiver, with a range of 1,000 miles, is specially manufactured for the In-

telligence Service of the United States?

Is it or is it not true that these Browning machine guns, 30-calibre, manufactured by Colt Patent Fire Arms of Hartford, Conn., are used in the United States Army at present and can be sold elsewhere only through treaties between governments?

This is presumably the "big stick" mentioned by the first Roosevelt?

President Kennedy said that there would not be any intervention in Cuba on the part of United States Armed Forces and that the Government would endeavor to see to it that no United States citizens participated in any activity against Cuba. However, at no time did he reply clearly to the questions of reporters regarding the assistance given to the counterrevolutionary elements. He was evasive and at times almost incoherent in his replies.

To the direct question of whether his Government would respect the law of neutrality and the charter of the Organization of the American States, which specifically prohibits the supplying of weapons or any type of assistance to any group intending to overthrow a foreign Government, President Kennedy limited himself to saying that there was a Revolutionary Committee here that obviously was eager to see a change in that country and that Mr. Castro had received some support from the United States and had received assistance in carrying out his own revolution

I have just been handed a note which informs me that the Secretary of State of this prodigious democracy, Mr. Dean Rusk, has stated that the United States has not interfered in the invasion that

took place in Cuba this morning but that the people of the United States are with the counterrevolutionaries. If that is so, for the second time we shall have to bury Jefferson and Lincoln.

With regard to the statement that Fidel Castro was supported by the Government of the United States in overthrowing the Batista tyranny, I do not think it deserves comment. It is as far from the truth as the United States rockets are from the moon. Suffice it to say that the Cuban revolution was never for sale.

As can be gathered from the information and commentaries in the American Press, for a week a debate has taken place within the Government about the attitudes to be followed regarding the invasion of Cuba and its concealment. The statements of President Kennedy prove that the White House has decided to keep to form and carry out the plans of aggression of the Pentagon and the Central Intelligence Agency. These statements became truly significant in the dawn of April 15, when pirate aircraft, flown by mercenaries in the service of the United States Government, bombed and strafed the capital of Cuba and the cities of San Antonio de los Baños and Santiago. This episode has been surrounded with singular cynicism. This is not the first time that the high regents of the empire have taken refuge in lies. The recent episode of the U-2 shows that this is an old story. It was an aggression clothed in calumny.

Official United States propaganda and officials of the United States Government stated that the attackers were members of the Revolutionary Air Force of Cuba who had rebelled against the Government and, in insubordination,

had bombed and strafed the aforementioned cities before leaving Cuba.

An abominable story has been concocted about the events that took place, in order to hide the true responsibility of the Government in Washington. The names of the criminals have been concealed. The aircraft which landed in Miami and Key West were not identified. The newspapers on April 16, as with one voice, published the statement of the State Department to the effect that, if the aircraft belonged to the Castro forces, they would be returned.

The Press Secretary of the White House stated that the Government of the United States still does not know whether these military planes that landed in Miami are to be handed back. The representative of the United States announced to the Political Committee at the meeting of April 15 that the necessary orders had been given to confiscate the Cuban planes that landed in Florida, and would not be allowed to take off to return to Cuba.

To all these declarations the delegation of Cuba must reply with this statement made yesterday by Prime Minister Fidel Castro before the graves of the victims — a statement that was made to thousands of Cubans. "I can see that President Kennedy must have some atom of shame, and that if this be the case, the Revolutionary Government of Cuba before the world challenges him to present to the United Nations the pilots and planes that he said left Cuban territory."

The machinery of military invasion is already rolling. This morning the mercenary forces of the Government of the United States, coming from Florida and Guate-

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

On Socialism and the Labor Movement

by Leon Trotsky

The Revolution Betrayed.....	cloth \$3.00	paper \$ 2.00
The Third International After Lenin.....	cloth \$4.00	paper 2.50
My Life		2.45
Stalin's Frame-Up System and the Moscow Trials.....		1.00
Marxism in the U. S.....		.35
If America Should Go Communist.....		.25
Literature and Revolution	cloth \$2.98	paper 1.50

by James P. Cannon

The History of American Trotskyism.....	cloth \$ 2.75	
Notebook of an Agitator.....	cloth \$4.00	paper 2.50
Socialism on Trial50
America's Road To Socialism.....		.35
The Road to Peace.....		.25
Socialism and Democracy15
The Coming American Revolution.....		.10

The Socialist Workers Party (<i>What It Is -- What It Stands For</i>) by Joseph Hansen.....		.25
Too Many Babies? (<i>A Marxist analysis of the "population explosion"</i>) by Joseph Hansen25
The Truth About Cuba by Joseph Hansen.....		.25
Why Can't Everybody Have a Job? by Fred Halstead.....		.10
The Long View of History by William F. Warde.....		.35
The Irregular Movement of History by William F. Warde....		.25
Negroes on the March by Daniel Guerin....	cloth \$1.50	paper .50
The Struggle For Negro Equality.....		.10
Anti-Negro Prejudice (<i>When It Began, How It Will End</i>) by George Breitman.....		.10

PIONEER PUBLISHERS

116 University Place, New York 3, N. Y.

Write for a free copy of our complete listing

G972.91063 H1981 LAC COP.2



THE
NETTIE LEE BENSON
LATIN AMERICAN COLLECTION

of
The General Libraries
University of Texas
at Austin